

SECTION 106 REVIEW
ARCHAEOLOGICAL/HISTORICAL INFORMATION
 Wisconsin Department of Transportation
 DT1635 99 (Replaces ED889)

SHPO

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project ID Project I.D. 1060-33-01	Highway/Street Zoo Interchange and approaches	County Milwaukee
Project Termini I-94 from 116 th to 76 th Street; US 45 from Union Pacific Railroad crossing south of Greenfield Avenue to Center Street		District SE Region (Waukesha)
Project Engineer/Project Manager Jim Liptack Wisconsin Department of Transportation		(Area Code) Telephone Number 262/548-8662
Consultant Project Manager Tim Anheuser/Kapur Associates		(Area Code) Telephone Number 414/916-8484
Archaeological and Architecture/History Consultant Traci Schnell Heritage Research David Keene Archaeological Research, Inc		(Area Code) Telephone Number Heritage Research: 262/251-7792 ARI: 773/975-1753
Date of Need April, 2008		SHSW: 08-0046/MI

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Type of Project	<input type="checkbox"/> Reconstruction <input type="checkbox"/> Wetland Mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/> Resurface Only <input type="checkbox"/> Bridge	<input type="checkbox"/> Recondition <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corridor Study (must coordinate with BOE)	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:
<input type="checkbox"/> Known Cemetery	Project Length N/A	New Right-of-way to be Acquired To be determined		

Project Description:

The recommended improvements include reconstructing the Zoo Interchange and its four approach legs to meet current design standards

Roadway dimensions☐ Add continuation sheet if needed.

Distance as measured from existing centerline	Existing	Proposed	Other Factors	Existing	Proposed
Right-of-Way Width	Varies	Varies	Terrace Width	N/A	N/A
Edge of outside shoulder from centerline of nearest driving lane	Varies	Varies	Sidewalk Width	N/A	N/A
Slope Intercept	To be determined	To be determined	Number of Lanes	6	6-8
Edge of pavement from centerline of nearest driving lane (Includes paved shoulder)	Varies	Varies	Grade Separated Crossing		
Back of Curb Line	N/A	N/A	Vision Triangle ____ acres ____ hectares	N/A	N/A
Easement ____ acres ____ hectares	To be determined	To be determined	Temporary Bypass ____ acres ____ hectares	N/A	N/A

Describe ground disturbing activity associated with proposed construction-e.g., strip, construction, slope grading, temporary bypass, realignment, stream channel charge, etc.

Ground disturbing activities will include clearing and grubbing, grading, shoulders and ditches, storm sewer construction at some locations, utility relocation, bridge removal and construction, and excavation of soils unsuitable for roadway construction.

III. NOTIFICATION

How has notification of the project been provided to:

X Property Owners

- ☒ Public Information Meeting Notice
(project mailing list = 14,000; not attached due to size)
☒ Letter [required for Archaeology]
☒ Telephone Call
☐ Other

X Historical Societies/Organizations

- ☒ Public Information Meeting Notice
☒ Letter
☐ Telephone Call
☐ Other

X Native American Tribes

- Must notify with:
☒ Public Info. Mtg. Notice
☒ Letter

*Attach one copy of the base letter, list of addresses and comments received. For history include telephone memos as appropriate. See attached correspondence

IV. AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT [APE]

HISTORY: Area of potential effect for history is one-half mile radius around the nine interchange.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Area of potential effect for archaeology is the existing and proposed right-of-way.

If you wish to claim there is no APE for buildings/structures, you must justify that claim. [NOTE: If there are no buildings/structures of any kind in the APE, go to Item V., check "Architecture/History survey is not needed" and state why.]

V. SURVEY NEEDED

ARCHAEOLOGY

- ☒ Archaeological survey is needed
[See Chapter 26-35-1 of FDM for procedure and # of exhibits]
☐ Archaeological survey is not needed – provide justification
☐ SHPO records search conducted ____ (date).
☐ Screening list ____ (date).
☐ Other:

HISTORY

- ☒ Architecture/History survey is needed
☐ Architecture/History survey is not needed

VI. SURVEY COMPLETED-Documentation required for submittal to BOE

See continuation page 4

ARCHAEOLOGY

- ☐ Project maps attached.
☒ ASFR attached [NO archaeological sites(s) identified]
☐ Report attached [sites recommended for further investigation]
☐ Report attached [potentially eligible site(s) avoided]
☐ Report attached - cemetery documentation
☐ Native American response letters & reports
[Send four reports + # of copies for NA requests to district.]

HISTORY

- ☐ A/HSF attached [NO buildings/structures identified]
☒ A/HSF attached [potentially eligible buildings/structures identified.]

VII. EVALUATION COMPLETED-Documentation required for submittal to BOE

- ☒ Report attached [no arch site(s) eligible for NRHP] ☐ DOE attached [no buildings/structure(s) eligible for NRHP]
☐ Report and DOE attached [arch site(s) eligible for NRHP] ☒ DOE attached [building/structure(s) eligible for NRHP]
☐ Report and draft DOE attached [arch site(s) eligible for NRHP—avoided through project redesign]

VIII. COMMITMENTS

None identified to date.

IX. PROJECT REVIEW

- ☐ No eligible properties in APE
☐ No effect on historic buildings and/or archaeological sites eligible for NRHP
☒ Eligible properties may be affected by project-go to Step 4: Assess effects and begin consultation

[Signature]
(Region Project Manager)
3/7/08
(Date)
[Signature]
(Consultant Project Manager)
3/7/08
(Date)

[Signature]
(WisDOT Historic Preservation Officer)
4/25/08
(Date)

see attached memo
(State Historic Preservation Officer)
(Date)

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM ----- **State of Wisconsin**
Bureau of Equity and Environmental Services/Division of Transportation System Development

Date: April 28, 2009

To: Carrie Cooper
Zoo Interchange Team
Southeast Region
141 NW Barstow Street
Waukesha WI 53187

From: Robert S. Newbery
Bureau of Equity and Environmental Services
Rm. 451 HFSTB



Project ID 1060-33-01
I94 & USH 45
Zoo Interchange
Milwaukee County

Sherman Banker, Compliance Reviewer for the State Historic Preservation Office, has informed BEES by phone that he will not be signing the Section 106 Review Form for this project. Further he has sent an email to BEES stating,

We look forward to assessing the affects (sic) that the proposed undertaking will have on historic properties that have previously been identified.

As near as we can surmise, his reasoning is that stating in writing that SHPO is looking forward to assessing effects documents the SHPO's acceptance of the results of the identification and evaluation steps of the Section 106 Review Process. I recommend that BEES use the Section 106 Review form that was signed by the Region and BEES and this memo to establish a paper trail that will allow the consultant, the Region, and FHWA to proceed with the preparation and approval of the Environmental Document. To that end, BEES will write in the space for the SHPO signature the words "see attached memo". (Said "attached memo" would be this one.) BEES will then provide a copy of that Section 106 Review form and this memo to the Region for use with the environmental document.

Note: At a meeting on April 27, 2009, Chip Brown, representing SHPO, agreed that when SHPO writes "we look forward to assessing the effects that the proposed undertaking will have on historic properties that have previously been identified" that is equal to signing the Section 106 Review form accepting the results of the identification and evaluation steps.

cc: FHWA